

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-13 are pending in the present application and Claims 1-13 are amended by the present amendment.

Claim amendments find support in the application as originally filed at least at page 12, lines 26-34. Thus, no new matter is added.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as indefinite; and Claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by Rudland et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,925,518, herein “Rudland”).

In response to the rejection of Claims 1-6 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, Claim 1 has been amended recite “an intelligent gateway connected to said common network layer.” Further, Claim 1 has been amended to recite “a common network layer that is designed to build a transparent access network.” Claim 6 has been amended to recite “a dumb gateway device according to claim 1, wherein said intelligent gateway communicates with said dumb gateway device.”

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1-6 are in compliance with all requirements under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

In regard to the rejection of Claims 1-13 under §102(e) as anticipated by Rudland, Applicant respectfully traverses that rejection.

In a non-limiting example of the present invention, Fig.3 shows several devices 5,6 that are connected to respective bus systems 7,8 which are connected to respective dumb gateways 3,4. These dumb gateways 3,4 are connected to a multimedia fiber-optic network optimized for automotive applications or a Media Oriented Systems Transport (MOST) network 2. Via a common network layer 300, these dumb gateways 3,4 connect to the MOST

network 2 which connects to an intelligent gateway 1. Using this connection, the intelligent gateway logically replaces the dumb gateways 3,4 and controls the functionality and commands of the bus systems 7,8 and in turn the devices 5,6 connected to the bus systems 7,8.

Claim 1 recites, in part,

A dumb gateway device for connecting a bus system with a common network layer that is designed to build a transparent access network by connecting at least one bus system via at least one dumb gateway device to said common network layer, said dumb gateway device comprising:

a bus service interface configured to access all functionality and commands of said bus system via said common network layer from an intelligent gateway connected to said common network layer

Rudland describes a bridging system for a communication system. Further, Rudland describes a first network 100 and a second network 105 connected using two gateways 107, 108. However, Rudland does not describe a bus service interface configured to access all functionality and commands of said bus system via said common network layer from an intelligent gateway connected to said common network layer.

In other words, Rudland describes a bridging scenario where the connection between the gateways 107, 108 is based on the communication standard defined by the connection between the gateways.

The outstanding Office Action cites Figure 3 elements 108 and 112<sup>1</sup> as corresponding to the dumb gateway device comprising the bus service interface described in Claim 1. However, the bus service interface described in Claim 1 is configured to access all functionality and commands of said bus system via said common network layer from an intelligent gateway connected to the common network layer. In contrast, the gateways described in Rudland, 108 and 112, access all functionality and commands themselves

---

<sup>1</sup> outstanding Office Action, page 3, paragraph 8.

instead of via a common network layer using an intelligent gateway connected to the common network layer. Accordingly as Rudland does not describe all the features of Claim 1, independent Claim 1 patentably distinguishes over Rudland.

Additionally, the common network layer described in Claim 1 is valid in all communication systems, including the bus systems connected to the respective gateways. The devices connected by the gateways are all part of the same transparent access network and more than one gateway may be connected to the network.

Thus, as a result of the transparent access, the intelligent gateway using the common network layer can connect to the bus service interface and access the functionality and commands of a bus system to which the intelligent gateway is not directly connected.

Accordingly, the invention described in Claim 1 allows integration of any number of gateways in any bus system or network that is connected, while Rudland describes connecting only two gateways by one dedicated connection.

Further, Rudland describes that both gateways need to host proxies. In contrast, one advantage of the invention described in Claim 1 is that only the intelligent gateway hosts proxies for conversion in both directions as well as for different bus systems. The dumb gateways are thus significantly cheaper as they require less processing power and do not require the expensive requirement of dynamic hosting of software modules.

Thus, the common network layer described in Claim 1 enables a single device to control the whole network, while in Rudland each device must include proxy software and control its own functions.

In other words, Rudland describes several gateways with similar processing power each including proxies, while the present invention described in Claim 1 describes several dumb gateways with limited processing power and no proxies and one intelligent gateway

with increased processing power which includes all the proxies and control elements of the network.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that independent Claim 1 and claims depending therefrom, patentably distinguish over Rudland.

Moreover, independent Claims 7 and 13 recite similar limitations to Claim 1 in that they describe a common network layer that is designed to build a transparent access network. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that independent Claims 7 and 13 and claims depending therefrom, similarly patentably distinguish over Rudland.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment, no further issues are believed to be outstanding in the present application, and the present application is believed to be in condition for formal Allowance. A Notice of Allowance for Claims 1-13 is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Bradley D. Lytle  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 40,073

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 06/04)

I:\ATTY\JL\282464US\282464US\_US.DOC